DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 064 CS 505 471

AUTHOR Vaughn, Mina A.
TITLE Uses of Rhetorical Strategies: A Comparative Analysis of the Pro-Slavery and Anti-Feminist Movements.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Comparative Analysis; Discourse Analysis; *Feminism; Group Dynamics; Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism; *Slavery; *Social Attitudes; Social Psychology; Social Values; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Paternalism; *Social Movements

ABSTRACT

An examination of the rhetoric of two social movements in the United States--the proslavery movement of the pre-Civil War Period and the anti-feminist movement of the 1970s--reveals that both contain a common theme, paternalism, and that both use similar rhetorical strategies to explicate the theme through a familial metaphor, Father. Examples of the rhetoric show that the authority of the symbolic Father is situated in a society where all social relations are perceived as a family, with a paternalistic father as head of the household. The rhetoric springs from the precepts of the Puritan value system rooted in the colonization of America and based on Judeo-Christian principles. These principles, which define right and wrong, good and bad, are grounded within beliefs about the superiority of males that rationalize and justify paternalistic impositions on both blacks and females. The rhetorical strategies of the two movements reflect the traditional social values, such as dependence, obedience, punishment, and protective security, of a paternalistic society. The historical and religious precedents in which these values are grounded provide a link between the two movements that transcends the passage of time. Five pages of notes are provided. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED278064

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# USES OF RHETORICAL STRATEGIES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PRO-SLAVERY AND ANTI-FEMINIST MOVEMENTS

by

Mina A. Vaughn*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mina A. Vaughn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*Ms. Vaughn is a doctoral student in the Department of Communication, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, 84112.

Paper presented at the annual Speech Communication Association Conference Chicago, Illinois, November 1986. The author gratefully acknowledges Professor Malcolm O. Sillars for his critical comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper.

CS505471

## Abstract

This paper examines the rhetoric of two social movements separated by over one hundred years. Specifically, it focuses on a comparison of the value orientation that emerged from the rhetorical strategies utilized to gain adherence. The analysis indicates that both movements share a common theme, paternalism, and utilize similar rhetorical strategies to explicate the theme through a familial metaphor, Father. The author suggests that the analysis of value-oriented arguments may reveal useful information about how values function to provide shared meanings for members within certain types of social movements across time.

During the past thirty years, rhetorical critics have shown a growing interest in examining social movements. For many such scholars, social movements are a special form of collective action motivated by a goal to make a change in, or repel changes to, the existing social order.[1] This special form of collective action involves a rhetoric based upon a dialectical tension between those seeking change and those striving to maintain the status quo. Thus, Herbert Simons and others claim movements are a genre of social action, different from other forms of collective behavior and exhibiting distinct rhetorical practices.[2] This perspective on movements and its clash with the view which disputes it,[3] raises an issue of interest to any rhetorical critic: Are there specific rhetorical strategies which can be identified in similar movements? The answer to this question ought to tell us more about the relationship of strategies to movements. That relationship ought to be revealed by comparing movements for strategy.

Yet, a 1980 review of over one hundred studies of social movements revealed only one comparative study: "Redefinition of Self: A Comparison of the Rhetoric of the Women's Liberation and Black Liberation Movements," by Diane Schaigh Hope.[4] She identifies, among other things, some rhetorical strategies used by both movements. For example, she found that both movements shared a redefinition-of-self rhetoric, and that the rhetors use metaphors based on each other's oppression.[5] A review of new studies in six major journals since 1980 revealed only one additional comparative study: "A Comparison of the Rhetorical Visions and Strategies of the Shah's White Revolution and the Ayatollah's Islamic Revolution," by D. Ray Hersey and J. David Trebing.[6] They discovered that, despite fundamental differences and conflicts, these opposed movements employed similar rhetorical strategies: support for national unity,[7] and "traditional" authority.[8]

While the observations from both pieces of research are interesting, one

might not find the discoveries too surprising since, in both instances, the movements operated within the same time frame, permitting the shared social conditions to provide a sense of identification. For example, in the last few years, anti-discrimination legislation has included both blacks and females. The promise of equality, for instance, and subsequent disappointments when equality failed to become a reality for members of both movements, would probably be expected to influence their rhetorical strategies, as they strive to negotiate their positions in modern society. Similarly, one might expect to discover that the Shah and the Ayatollah would utilize a strategy that is grounded in basic Iranian values, since arguments of the rhetors of both movements are directed to the same social order.

A better test of the link of strategies to movements might be the examination of two movements separated by time. Because the rhetorical situation would have altered with time, the rhetorical strategies might be controlled less by the same exigencies as would two movements which shared a more temporally common rhetorical situation. In such instances, one would need to explicate the factors that give rise to similarities in the patterns of discourse which are manifested in the movements.

An extensive examination of the literature of the pro-slavery movement and of the anti-feminist movement revealed similarities in rhetorical strategies, despite the differences in issues and separation in time by over one hundred years.[9] The purpose of this essay was to analyze the rhetorically embedded cultural values that created shared meanings for the social communities, and how they warranted the strategies used in both movements to gain adherence for the rhetors' claims.[10] A pattern of strategies that developed through the tradition of paternalism in this country was found in the analysis of the two movements. This pattern identified the quinessential value concepts of a paternalistic society in which Father, as the dominant metaphor in the theme,

provided an understanding of the temporal and cultural continuity that linked the two movements together. The analysis revealed that the metaphor had three strategic ways of explicating the theme: Father as Protector, Father as Judge, and Father as Punisher.

Paternalistic Societies

Paternalism flourishes in a society where male dominion is an accepted value of the social system. As Richard Sennett has noted, paternalism differs from patriarchy. A patriarchal society is one in which "all people are consciously related by blood ties. Each person defines his or her relationship to anyone else in the society in terms of lineage."[11] Inheritance passes from generation to generation through the male line; the social order of a family is marked by the supremacy of the father because he has material control. In a paternalistic society, however, the basis is symbolic.

A symbol can be defined as an instrument used by people to codify their experiences or create a map of their territorial experience. Symbols are ambiguous and stand for a multiplicity of meanings, meanings which are ascribed by human beings and bestowed on them by agreement or convention. Symbols unite and transcend individual and collective differences.[12]

A metaphor implies symbolism because "metaphor disengages the word from the thing signified."[13] Metaphors are semantic modes through which relationships and identifications are accomplished. They have consequences in how people feel and behave toward one another.[14] In a paternalistic society, the metaphor, Males are Fathers, emerges as a symbol to establish and define the social relationships where head of family status is ascribed to Fathers. The metaphor is extended to society, in general, to support the value of paternalism. Society is viewed as a family and the family members confer authority on the symbolic Father role. The paternalistic basic

assumption about the framework of society sustains the metaphor, which provides the auditors with ways to understand, as well as how to act on that understanding.

The metaphor, Males are Fathers, establishes the basis of control over the members of a society. The control is based on the notion that certain chronologically mature, but intellectually or socially immature, individuals are deficient in knowledge and lacking in the capacity to think rationally and in the ability to carry out decisions. To interfere in their lives, then, is to do no more than they would do were they rational people. Therefore, the authority figure is not really opposing their will, nor interfering with their freedom.[15]

Not surprising, the value orientation of the paternalistic theme predicts that the consciousness of the symbolic Child will emerge in the ideology. Certainly, Fathers have to have someone to father, so the relationship between Father/Child is abstracted from real parent/child relationships, where the person says, "I'm doing this for your own good." As a justification for imposing his will, the symbolic Father's rationale for his imposition is claimed to be motivated by concern for the welfare of the person imposed upon.[16] There is, however, an important distinction in the nature of the two situations. In the real relationship, the parental goal is to teach the child to be a competent and independent adult. In the symbolic relationship, the Father/Child metaphor is frozen. That is, the Father is always the Father, and the Child is always the Child; the Child does not experience growth toward independence. It is indeed a "false Love."[17]

In a paternalistic society, a good father is one who is "both convinced that he knows what is good for his dependents and has the power to insist that his ideas are carried out."[18] The metaphor must be strong enough to give the societal members guidelines for behavior and signify the nature of their

participation in the extended family.[19] In order for the Father to substantiate the sufficiency of the motive for maintaining the relationship, he must establish the credibility of his role, which is based on value judgments about trustworthiness and competence.[20] One rhetorical strategy for achieving this goal is to convince the Child, and others, that Father is a Protector.

Father as Protector

In the first strategy, Father is the Protector of dependent children. One of the underlying premises of this relationship is that certain people are "authorized to control the boundaries of reality for other people."[21] Thus, the rationale for the relationship is one of dependence, so the rhetorical discourse must mandate the value of being dependent. In the pro-slavery arguments, the master is presented not as a haughty and dominating tyrant, but as "the head of the largest family"[22] who "occupies towards slaves the place of parent or guardian, for he is but a grown child and must be governed as a child."[23] George Fitzhugh, author, editor and a leading proponent of the pro-slavery position, justifies slavery by expounding on the plight of serfs in the Baltic provinces of Russia:

> They bitterly lamented the freedom, as it was called, which was forced upon them. . . .The serf often mournfully complains that he has lost a father and kept a master, and his lord now often refuses the little requests of his peasants saying, 'You know you are not my children now.'[24]

The slaveholder, on the other hand, is a protective Father and committed to the dependent Child's best interests. In some instances, the dependent Child, a slave, is the spokesperson that gives credibility to the claim. In an essay, allegedly written by a Georgian slave, the rhetor argues that the blacks in the non-slave states are subordinates for life, but without protection, while a slave is a slave for life, but has a master, bound by law, to protect him. He concludes:

> So, you see, the slave has someone that is pecuniarly interested in his welfare, who therefore extends to him every advantage that will preserve and augment longevity; whereas the other is. . .in a climate that is not congenial to his health and no one cares for him.[25]

In the example above, the notion of masters as metaphorical Fathers sustains the value of dependence by justifying the security of paternalistic imposition. A pro-slavery spokesperson from North Carolina agrees that slaves feel more secure with their master's protection, and argues further that some individuals actually choose to be dependent. In a Washington speech that was later included in a popular anthology of pro-slavery arguments, Bryan Tyson says:

> At all events, the felicity of the bond servant is such that I have actually known free persons of color to choose their masters and voluntarily enslave themselves. Rather than weary with the burdens of life. . .they had rather pick out some good, kind, humane man for a master, who they knew would treat them well, than to have their liberty and thus be taxed with cares and concerns of life.[26]

In both of the examples above, one sees the establishment of the protector-protected relationship, and in one instance, the relationship is further legitimized because it is "bound by law." A similar rhetorical approach emerges in some of the anti-feminist arguments. In The Power of the Positive Woman, Phyllis Schlafly, leading spokesperson for the anti-feminist movement, argues against "gender-free" equality since such equality would negate the various federal and state laws designed to "protect the institution of the family."[27] Further, equality would deny the female her right to have "physical, financial and emotional security of the home--for all of her life."[28]

Whether bound by law or not, Father as Protector offers females, as well as slaves, freedom from potential worries and insecurities. Schlafly asserts that "nothing in this world is sure except death and taxes, but marriage and motherhood are the most reliable security the world can offer."[29] It is the

male, of course, as Father/Protector, to which females must turn for this secure state of existence. Schlafly extends her argument but pointing out the value of being dependent on another person:

> Any successful vehicle must have one person at the wheel with ultimate responsibility. When I fly on a plane or sail on a ship, I'm glad there is one captain who has the final responsibility and can act decisively in a crisis situation. A family cannot be ruled by a committee.[30]

Schlafly reminds her audience that every successful country and company have one "chief executive officer," and that females need to be reminded that a similar system is necessary if "marriage is to be a successful institution."[31] Marabel Morgan, another anti-feminist spokesperson and author of The Total Woman, points out to her audience that accepting the male as Father/Protector is rewarding to the female as it "increases her status and worth in her husband's eyes" since it is "only when a woman surrenders her life to her husband, reveres him, worships him, and is willing to serve him, that she becomes truly beautiful to him."[32] Females, then, can only be "protected" within the paternal structure; a structure which precludes any rhetoric of female liberation. Dependence and obedience are requisites for the privilege of protection, and are, according to Schlafly and Morgan, ascribed as positive values in the Bible. As evidence, Schlafly quotes a paternalistic analog from Saint Paul: "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church,"[33] and Morgan claims that "God ordained man to be the head of the family."[34]

The use of biblical quotations is a rhetorical strategy that emerges in the pro-slavery movement, as well. In the anthology, Cotton Is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, Dr. Thorton Stringfellow, author and theologian, also calls on the words of Paul: "Servant, be obedient to those who are your masters, according to the flesh with fear and trembling in a singleness of

heart unto Christ. . . ."[35] Similar to Schlafly's example, the pro-slavery rhetor selects a scripture that reinforces the value of obedient behavior from the dependent Child.

Obedience is not without its rewards, however, as the Child actually acquires a "freedom" as a result of such acceptable behavior. Arianna Stassinopoulos, anti-feminist proponent and author of The Female Woman, points out some of the rewards.[36] For example, she claims that women, in their proper role of wife and mother, are protected from the worst tasks since they are not "subject equally to the tyranny of work," and are "freed from the pressures of ambition and status."[37] Stassinopoulos cites the laundromat and can opener as proof that "the housewife, far from being a captive of her work, has far more freedom in it than most men."[38]

In a similar vein, William Harper, Chancellor of South Carolina, argues that devoted and obedient slaves have been freed by their masters from an existence "stained with every crime that can debase human nature to a level with the brute Creation."[39] This freedom was acquired by "transplanting them from their native, dark and barbarous regions. . .from the state of debasement in which he was born, to a place in civilized society."[40] In an address before the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, Reverend How, President of Dickinson college, argues:

> Instead of debased savages, they are, to a considerable extent, civilized, enlightened, and christenized. Their physical condition is greatly improved. Whoever else may writhe and groan under want or debt, the slave feels neither and fears neither, he works on, he sleeps, whistles on, for he is the merriest of all mortals.[41]

The underlying assertion that Father as Protector creates a happy condition for his Child emerges consistently as a strategy in the discourse of the rhetors in pro-slavery and anti-feminist arguments. Moreover, the paternalistic theme personalizes the social demands for the Child to submit to

Father's control and domination. Since metaphoric children are forever deprived of the experience of fulfilling their own roles of authority, however, they may become discontented over time. To guard against potential crises that might threaten the continued leadership of the Father, the arguments are extended to justify Father as Judge.

Father as Judge

The rhetors present reasons as to why the Child must remain a Child in the rhetorical strategy, Father as Judge. In the rhetoric of the pro-slavery and anti-feminist movements, the reality of this relationship is based on superiority/inferiority, which justifies the continued subordination of the Child to the Father. One of the warrants for establishing the slave's inferiority in the pro-slavery movement centers around the issue of the value placed on morality. The paternalistic Judges are authorized to define the nature of moral conduct and then argue that immorality debases slaves and makes them unfit for freedom. In his address mentioned earlier, the Reverend How expounds on the breadth of the slaves' immorality:

> Envy, jealousy, revenge, deception, insincerity, and the most indiscriminate profligacy have the countenance of universal practice. Selfishness. . .is the passion of their hearts: a selfishness which regards neither justice, nor humanity, nor decency, nor kindred, nor friendship;--a selfishness which produces falsehood, theft, fraud, drunkenness, gluttony and debauchery.[42]

Lack of morality is not the only criterion for judging the slave as a means of demonstrating his inferiority and justifying human bondage. In a defense of slavery phamplet, responding to Henry Clay's publication on emancipation, a southern clergyman claims that the curse of Canaan inflicted on the African race "gave the flat skull and other physical changes which stamp upon them the inferiority of the intellect."[43] Dr. Josiah C. Nott, distinguished surgeon, lecturer and contributor of many articles to the leading scientific journals of America, calls on the credibility of his

medical profession to support his argument for the intellectural inferiority of the entire race:

> The brain of the Negro, as I have stated is according to positive measurements, smaller than the Caucasian by a full tenth; and this deficiency exists particularly in the anterior portion of the brain, which is known to be the seat of higher faculties.[44]

These and similar arguments, offer grounds for Father as Judge to conclude that the slave is inferior, and therefore, must always remain a Child. Further, the arguments support the notion that slaveholding is a paternalistic act; one that assist slaves in "emerging from savage life."[45]

In the anti-feminist movement, as well, the value of intelligence emerges as a justification for the superior Father to maintain his authority over the inferior Child. While the rhetors do not claim that females are unequivocally less intelligent than males, they argue that her female kind of intelligence justifies the paternalistic imposition on her life, particularly in choosing a career. Stassinopoulos asserts that men are superior in verbal reasoning, comprehension, analytical thinking and problem solving. By contrast, females possess qualities, such as "cooperation and nurturance," which enable them to "relate to other people and to interact with them person to person."[46] The paternalistic Father is justified to intervene in defining the role best suited for the inferior Child. According to Schlafly, female intelligence is best suited to help females fulfill their "natural role" of wife and mother.[47] She claims that females should accept these differences in males and females because they are designed by the "Divine Architect of the human race" and even warns females that they should shy away from seeking certain kinds of knowledge:

> The worse thing that a woman can possibly do is to take a 'women's studies' or some other sociology or psychology course in college. Some of these courses should be called 'How to Break Up A Marriage'. . . .If she is floudering, in, search of a purpose, these courses are a psychological

> red-light district where fundamental values are exchanged for fleeting stimulants at an exorbitant price.[73]

In this instance, the argument centers around knowledge as a negative value. The "knowledge is bad" argument is a rhetorical strategy used by pro-slavery rhetors, as well. In a letter to an English abolitionist, James Henry Hammond, Governor of South Carolina and a leading spokesperson for the movement, writes of the inherent dangers in educating slaves:

> If the Catholics deem it wrong to trust the bible to the hands of the ignorant, shall we be excommunicated because we will not give it, and with it the corrupt and fatal commentaries of the abolitionists, to our slaves? Allow our slaves to read your writings, stimulating them to cut our throats! Can you believe us to be such unspeakable fools?[49]

It appears that the differences between males and females, as designed by Schlafly's "Divine Architect" are similar to the differences between free men and slaves as designed by the pro-slavery rhetor's Creator, who "did not intend that every individual should be highly cultivated, morally and intellectually, for as we have seen, he has imposed conditions on society which would render that impossible."[50] In both arguments, Father as Judge calls on the authority of the Supreme Father to support his judgment that the Child in a relationship is inferior, and argues that it is the duty of the Father to restrict the Child's freedom. It is these restrictions that set boundaries for acceptable social conduct. However, like real children, the symbolic Child sometimes violates these boundaries, and Father as Punisher has a moral obligation to punish the transgressions, so that the Child will be reminded of his role within the familial relationship.

Father as Punisher

Punishment is one of the assumptions on which a paternalistic society is built and maintained. Viewed as a positive value, it is legitimized as a linkage in the relationship between the social rules and the ideology of the social system. The prescribed style of the rhetoric is to stress duties,

rather than rights. The desires of the symbolic Child do not present a conflict for the symbolic Father. Because of his superiority, it is the paternalistic obligation of the Father as Punisher to punish the Child for behavior which Father as Judge deems unacceptable.

Punishment may assume three forms: verbal, physical and legal. In the first form, Father as Punisher plays on the Child's fears, in ways similar to those in real relationships. For example, the pro-slavery rhetors argue that terrible results will occur should slaves be freed. Harrison Berry, the slave, warns his fellow slaves:

> I have been told, and that, too, by men, whose authority cannot be doubted by any who know them, that in the cities of non Slave-holding States, it is a common thing to see poor, half-naked, and starving creatures, standing on corners, begging everyone passing by for a penny.[51]

Such a condition is not surprising he adds, as "the colored man is a colored man anywhere. He is but the tool North, and the servant South."[52]

Other rhetors, such as Hammond, use the "poor and laboring classes of your own race and color" in Great Britain to illustrate the punishments inflicted on free Africans:

> The coal mines are worked altogether by boys eight to twelve years of age, on all-fours, with a dog and belt chain. . .dragging the barrows with one hundred weight of coal and the empty barrows back without once straightening their backs unless they choose to stand under the shaft and run the risk of having their heads broken by falling coal.[53]

Hammond describes negative values, such as harsh punishment, meager wages and twelve to sixteen hour work days. Hunger, he claims, is common place: "There have been found such occurrences as seven, eight and ten persons in one cottage, I cannot say for one day, but more for whole days, without a morsel of food."[54] Finally, he illustrates the "deplorable moral state," as related by a fourteen year old free female:

> I always work without stockings, shoes or trousers. I

> wear nothing but a shift. I have to go up to the headings with the men. They are all naked there. I am got used to that.[55]

Hammond uses these examples to describe conditions, which he claims, slaveholders would never inflict on American slaves in their paternalistic society. By playing on the Child's fear through the use of verbal punishment, the Father attempts to illicit feelings of guilt and remorse about any longings the Child may have to become a part of the adult world. Such a strategy is designed to keep the Father/Child relationship in place.

Father as Punisher inflicts physical punishment, as well, and the abuse is justified, rhetorically, by usage of what Phillip Wander has identified as the Savage Child metaphor.[56] The rhetors claim that slavery is God's punishment on the African race, but that slavery has "done more to elevate a degraded race in the scale of humanity; to tame the savage, to cultivate the barbarous. . .and to spread the blessings of christianity among the heather, than all the missionaries that philanthropy and religion have ever sent forth."[57] In a debate before the Virginia Legislature, Thomas R. Dew, Professor at William and Mary College, claims:

> There is nothing but slavery which can destroy those habits of indolence and sloth, and eradicate the character of improvidence and carelessness, which mark the independent savage. He may truly be compared to the wild beast of the forest. . . .[58]

According to the pro-slavery rhetors, slaves are, at best, savages and perpetual children to whom blows are not degrading.[59] Hammond compares flogging slaves to that "necessary coadjutor of the school master, the birch" and further authorizes the physical punishment of slaves by reminding his audience that Solomon counselled parents against sparing the rod and spoiling the child.[60] The paternalistic theme, then, of the pro-slavery rhetoric sanctions Father as Punisher, who is merely fulfilling his Godly duties for the welfare of the savage Child.

In the anti-feminist rhetoric, Father as Punisher does not inflict physical punishment, but the argument to justify verbal punishment is similar to that of the pro-slavery argument. The rhetorical strategy is to punish, by creating fear that will motivate the symbolic Child to adhere to the paternalistic social values. For example, Schlafly describes the female who leaves her family to "follow the siren call" of Women's liberation:

> . . .no happy noises of teenagers and their friends, no football of a faithful husband in the kitchen, no gurgling of grandchildren eager to be cuddled. She will come 'home' to a cold lonely apartment whose silence is broken only by the occasional visits of men who size her up as one with a liberated view of sex, societal restraints and the institution of marriage. . . .[78]

The anti-feminist argument that terrible results will occur if the Equal Rights Amendment is passed is similar to the argument against freeing the slaves. In this instance, females are warned that they will be drafted and sent into military combat, to be "slaughtered and maimed. . . ,"[62] that divorced women may lose their right to presume custody of the children, and along with it, "a reasonably fair divorce settlement,"[63] but may obtain the obligation to support a lazy husband who "wants to spend his time drinking and watching television."[64] The rhetors also warn of losing gender designated restrooms in public buildings and schools,[65] while gaining homosexuals as schoolteachers.[66]

In the arguments above, Father as Punisher uses "if-then" arguments as a rhetorical strategy. As such, the verbal punishment plays on the fears of the Child, and serves as a warning of the consequences for those who do not respond to the paternalistically justified values. This strategy assumes that the punishment will enable the Child to determine the nature of the wrongdoing and reform. On the other hand, paternalistic legal punishment justifies state coercion on the grounds that those in the power position know what is best for the individuals in the society and must stand as permanent guardians.[67]

In the pro-slavery movement discourse, one strategy to justify the laws that constitute legal punishment to the slaves is to argue "the public good" of such laws. In this argument, rhetors, such as Albert Bledsoe, educator and editor of the Southern Review, reinforce the image of the slave as a savage, who, if not enslaved, will "fall into idleness and vagrancy and even lapse into barbarism."[68] Legal sanctions are necessary in order to control the behavior of the savages and constrain them from "following the promptings of their evil hearts."[69] Additionally, slave laws provide the deserving Father his rights to "leisure for intellectual pursuits, or means of acquiring the comforts and elegancies of life."[70]

The legal punishment is for the good of the Child as well, however, since without a symbolic Father he will be unable to take care of himself:

> No man gives personal freedom to his child because he deems it always and in all cases a good. His heart teaches him a better doctrine when the highest good is concerned.[71]

Whether to protect society from the savage, or the Child from himself, the rhetors justify the law on the grounds that it has evolved from God's Law.[72]

The anti-feminists utilize a "God's Law" rhetorical strategy, as well. Schlafly claims that the Declaration of Independence is the only law needed because it "proclaims truth and facts that are not subject to change."[73] She argues the value of its "pristine purity" by defining the paternalistic view of equality it espouses:

> The Declaration of Independence declares that each of us is created equal. This means equal before God. It does not mean that all men are born with equal abilities and so on, as some try to claim. Nor does it mean that all men can be made equal, as Communistic dogma alleges.[74]

As an example of the negative value of manmade laws, Schlafly cites Great Britain and claims that this country's laws are punitive because of the effect "on the family through the destructive goal of equality. . . ."[75]

The rhetors of both movements, it appears, argue that punishment is for

the good of the symbolic Child, and the examples suggest that Father as Punisher plays an integral role in maintaining and sustaining the paternalistic value of male superiority. But, Father as Punisher interacts with Father as Protector and Father as Judge in a paternalistic society whose rhetoric is dominated by the Father metaphor. It is the triumviarte of the three roles, then, that characterize the paternalistic theme that can be identified in the rhetorical strategies of the pro-slavery and anti-feminist movements.

Conclusion

The pro-slavery movement and the anti-feminist movement share a common theme, paternalism. Both movements utilize similar rhetorical strategies to explicate the theme through a traditional familial metaphor, Father. The authority of the symbolic Father is situated in a society where all social relations are perceived as a family, with a paternalistic Father, as head of the household.

A historical precedent serves as a guideline for future actions and the guideline can be traced to the precepts of the puritan value system rooted in the colonization of America, which are based on Judao-Christian principles. These principles, which define right and wrong, good or bad, are grounded within beliefs about the superiority of males which rationalize and justify paternalistic impositions on both blacks and females. The Bible, as the basis of Judao-Christian beliefs, authorizes male sovereignty. The rhetorical strategies of the pro-slavery and anti-feminist movements reflect the traditional social values, such as dependence, obedience, punishment and protective security, of a paternalistic society. The historical and religious precedents in which these values are grounded, provide a linkage between the two movements that transcends the passage of time.

That values are relatively enduring and show little change over time is supported by extensive research.[76] This finding provides some explanation for the strategical similarities of the two different movements. One would expect to see a society's ideology expressed through values in the rhetoric. Some differences between the pro-slavery and anti-feminist movements did emerge, however. These may be understood if one examines some of the options which resolve argumentative disagreements and cause a society to make adaptations in its value systems.

One such option is "value-reemployment," which asks that individuals redeploy the nature of a particular value and adjust how it will be applied.[77] For example, within the pro-slavery movement, the paternalistic value, superiority, gave slaveholders the "right" to own blacks as slaves. When this right was abolished through the Act of Emancipation, the arguments surrounding the morality of the ownership of human beings were no longer an issue, and hence, did not emerge as a strategy for maintaining male dominance in the anti-feminist movement. While women, as a group, were never sold into slavery, other paternalistic practices rationalized and justified the hegemonic relationship between superior males and inferior females. Thus, the value of superiority was not abandoned; only the nature of its application was changed.

In other instances, the option of "value-restandardization" may bring about an adaptation in value systems.[78] In this case, a value is adapted to the context of the situation and takes on a different meaning when converted to belief statements. For example, the paternalistic value placed on punishment in the pro-slavery arguments arose in the anti-feminist arguments, as well. Beliefs about physical punishment have evolved over time, however, so the application of the value has been restandardized to preclude arguments relating to physical punishment.

Though some differences in value adaptations were noted, the analysis of the pro-slavery movement and the anti-feminist movement suggests that the rhetors used similar strategies, based on the value concepts of a paternalistic society, to gain adherence for their arguments. That paternalism appears to have maintained the rhetorical strategies is not too surprising. A paternalistic society was well established in England by the forefathers of the American colonists and the presumption of history might tend to predict that the tradition of paternalism could sustain its power over time.[79] Too, identifying the family metaphor is not significant in and of itself. Other scholars have investigated the dominance of the metaphor in early American historical rhetoric.[80] What may be of some interest, however, is that the analysis suggests that a particular kind of discourse can be identified within a paternalistic theme which is signified by specific characteristics. These characteristics create specific forms of rhetorical strategies. Explicating the specific forms (Father as Protector, Father as Judge, and Father as Punisher) that emerge in both movements provides some understanding about how the tradition of paternalism was preserved by a particular adaptation of the family metaphor across time.

Finally, the results of this essay suggest that an analysis of the value-oriented arguments may provide the critic with a useful approach for comparing similarities between movements. The underlying assumption is that value statements characterize the relationship between a movement and its strategies and forms. Since values exist in all persuasive discourse, an examination of value-oriented arguments may reveal some interesting information about how values function to provide shared meanings for societal members within certain types of social movements.

Notes

[1]For example, see Robert S. Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Speech, Spring 1972, pp. 82-39; Charles J. Stewart, "A Functional Approach to the Rhetoric of Social Movements," Central states Speech Journal, Winter 1980, pp. 298-305.

[2]Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, February 1970, pp. 1-11.

[3]While some scholars place narrow definitions on the phenomena, which they claim, can be studied as movements, other scholars, with whom this author agrees, argue for a broader perspective in defining movement studies. For example, see Michael Calvin McGee, ""Social Movement: Phenomenon or Meaning?," Central States Speech Journal, 31 (Winter 1980), pp. 233-243; Malcolm O. Sillars, "Defining Movements Rhetorically: Casting the Widest Net," The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 46 (Fall 1980), pp. 17-32.

[4]Susan Volman Riches & Malcolm O. Sillars, "The Status of Movement Criticism," The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44 (1980), pp. 275-287; Diane Schaigh Hope, ""Redefinition of Self: A Comparison of the Rhetoric of the Women's Liberation and Black Liberation Movements," Today's Speech, 23 (Winter 1975) pp. 17-26.

[5]Hope, p. 23.

[6]This researcher reviewed the following journals: Central States Speech Journal, Communication Monographs, Communication Quarterly, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Southern Speech Communication Journal and The Western Journal of Speech Communication. D. Ray Hersey & J. David Trebing, "A Comparison of the Rhetorical Visions and Strategies of the Shah's White Revolution and the Ayatollah's Islamic Revolution and the Ayatollah's Islamic Revolution," Communication Monographs, 50 (June 1983), pp. 158-174.

[7]Hersey & Trebing, p. 161.

[8]Hersey & Trebing, p. 172.

[9]Pro-slavery discourse from the decade preceding the Civil War (1851-1861) was examined. This period, marking the culmination of pro-slavery thought, saw a dramatic increase in published treatises, letters and phamplets over previous years. Additionally, the presentation of the case took the form of republished collections of pro-slavery writings that had come to be recognized as classics. The pro-slavery discourse analyzed in this essay is a representative sample of some 1100 pages of the most popular pro-slavery writings of this period. The anti-feminist analysis focuses, primarily, on the discourse of Phyllis Schlafly, who was, from the beginning, the leading spokesperson for the movement. Her book, The Power of the Positive Woman and the Phyllis Schlafly Reports, along with the arguments from other anti-feminist rhetors, were examined for a six year period beginning in 1972 when Congress sent the ERA amendment to the states for ratification.

[10]Malcolm O. Sillars & Patricia Ganer, ""Values and Beliefs: A

Systematic Basis for Argumentation," in Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research, ed. Robert Cox & Charles Arthur Willard, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982) pp. 184-201.

[11]Richard Sennett, Authority, (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), p. 52.

[12]Charles Stewart, Craig Smith & Robert E. Denton, Jr., Persuasion and Social Movements, (Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc., 1984).

[13]Stewart, Smith and Denton, p. 186.

[14]Sennett, p. 79.

[15]Gerald Dworkin, "Paternalism," in Paternalism, ed. Rolf Sartorius, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), pp. 19-34.

[16]John Kleinig, Paternalism, (New Jersey: Rowan & Allanheld, 1984).

[17]Sennett, p. 82.

[18]David Roberts, Paternalism in Early Victorian England, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979), p. 5.

[19]J. David Sapir, "The Anatomy of a Metaphor," in The Social Use of Metaphor, ed. J. David Sapir & J. Christopher Crocker, (n.p.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977).

[20]Sillars & Ganer, pp. 196-197.

[21]Sennett, p. 67.

[22]George Fitzhugh, Sociology for the South or the Failure of Free Society, (New York: Burt Franklin, 1854), p. 248.

[23]Fitzhugh, p. 83.

[24]George Fitzhugh, "The Edinburgh Review on Southern Slavery," in Cannibals All! or Slaves Without Masters, ed. C. Vann Woodward, (1857; rpt. Massachusetts: the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 161.

[25]Harrison Berry, "Slavery and Abolition as Viewed by A Georgian Slave," in A Defense of Southern Slavery and Other Phamplets, (1861; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 27.

[26]Bryan Tyson, "The Institution of Slavery in the Southern States, Religiously, and Morally Considered in Connection With Our Sectional Troubles," in A Defense of Southern Slavery and Other Phamplets, (1861; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 13.

[27]Phyllis Schlafly, The Power of the Positive Woman, (New York: Jove Publications, Inc., 1977).

[28]"What's Wrong with 'Equal Rights' for Women?" The Phyllis Schlafly Report, Feb. 1972.

[29]Schalfly, Positive Woman, p. 47.

[30]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 50.

[31]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 50.

[32]Marabel Morgan, The Total Woman, (New York: Pocket Books, 1977), p. 27.

[33]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 49.

[34]Morgan, p. 77.

[35]Thornton Stringfellow, "The Bible Argument: or Slavery in the Light of Divine Revelation, " in Cotton Is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, ed. E.N. Elliott, (1860; rpt. Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 463.

[36]Arianna Stassinopulos, The Female Woman, (New York: Random House, 1973).

[37]Stassinpoulos, pp. 89-90.

[38]Stassinopoulos, p. 95.

[39]William Harper, "Slavery in the Light of Social Ethics," in Cotton Is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, ed. E.N. Elliott, (1860; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 560.

[40]Harper, p. 598.

[41]Samuel Blanchard How, Slaveholding Not Sinful: Slavery the Punishment of Man's Sin, It's Remedy, The Gospel of Christ, (1855; rpt. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 339.

[42]How, pp. 79-80.

[43]A Southern Gentlemen, "A Defense of Slavery Against the Attacks of Henry Clay and Alex'r. Campbell," in A Defense of Southern Slavery and Other Phamplets, (1851; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 6.

[44]Josiah C. Nott, "The Letters on the Natural History of the Caucasian and Negro Races," The Ideology of Slavery. ed. Drew Gilpin Faust, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), pp. 206-238.

[45]Harper, p. 563.

[46]Stassinopoulos, pp. 99-100.

[47]"How ERA Will Hurt Men," The Phyllis Schlafly Report, May, 1975.

[48]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 59.

[49]James Henry Hammond, "Letter to an English Abolitionist," in Cotton Is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, ed. E.N. Elliott, (1860; rpt. Negro Universities Press, 1969). p. 654. This letter was originally written in

1845, but not published until 1860.

[50]Hammond, p. 637.

[51]Berry, p. 27.

[52]Berry, p. 27.

[53]James Henry Hammond, "Hammond's Letters on Slavery," in Pro-Slavery Argument, (1852; rpt, New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968), pp. 99-174.

[54]Hammond, Pro-Slavery Argument, p. 137.

[55]Hammond, Cotton Is King, p. 659.

[56]Phillip C. Wander, "The Savage Child: "The Image of the Negro in the Pro-Slavery Movement," The Southern Speech Communication Journal 37 (Summer 1972), pp. 335-360.

[57]Harper, p. 596.

[58]Thomas R. Dew, "Professor Dew on Slavery," in Pro-Slavery Argument, (1852; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968), p. 328.

[59]William Harper, "Memoir on Slavery," in Pro-Slavery Argument, (1852; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968), pp. 1-98.

[60]Hammond, Cotton Is King, p. 643.

[61]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 63.

[62]Senator J. Erwin, U.S. Congress, Senate, 92nd Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, 118 (21 Mar. 1972), 9333.

[63]"How ERA Will Hurt Divorced Women," The Phyllis Schlafly Report, May 1974.

[64]Schlafly, Positive Woman, pp. 75-76.

[65]Senator Sam J. Erwin, U.S. Congress, Senate, 92nd Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, 118 (21 Mar. 1972), 9333.

[66]"ERA and Homosexual Marriages." The Phyllis Schlafly Report, Sept. 1974.

[67]Joel Feinberg, "Legal Paternalism," Paternalism, ed. Rolf Sartorius, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), pp. 3-18.

[68]Albert Taylor Bledsoe, "Liberty and Slavery: Or In the Light of Moral and Political Philosophy," in Cotton Is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments, ed E.N. Elliott (1860; rpt. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 397.

[69]How, p. 33.

[70]Harper, Cotton Is King, p. 564.

[71]Bledsoe, p. 402.

[72]How, p. 28.

[73]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 168.

[74]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 167.

[75]Schlafly, Positive Woman, p. 169.

[76]Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968).

[77]Nicolas Rescher, "The Study of Value Change," in Value Theory in Philosophy and Social Sciences. ed. Erwin Laszlo & James B. Wilbur, (New York: Gordon and Breach, 1973).

[78]Rescher, p. 16.

[79]For an interesting account of the roots of paternalism, see David Roberts, Paternalism in Early Victorian England, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979).

[80]For example, see J. Vernon Jensen, "British Voices on the Eve of the American Revolution: Trapped by the Family Metaphor," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63 (February 1977), pp. 43-50.